

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Applicants initially note that the objections to Claims 61, 66, and 67 noted in paragraph 3 of the outstanding Office Action are addressed by the present response. More specifically, the proper rewritten Claim 61 is presented herein and each of Claims 66 and 67 is herein amended to now properly recite "optical means".

Claims 15-37, 39, 41, 42, 45-59, 61-79, 81-83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 95, 96, and 98-100 are pending in this application. Claims 15-35, 39, 41, 42, 45-59, 63-65, 67-77, 79, 81-83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 95, 96, and 100 are allowed. Claims 36, 37, 61, 62, 66, 78, 98, and 99 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the admitted art in view of U.S. patent 5,450,211 to Kanai et al. (herein "Kanai") and JP 8-62522 to Nishimura et al. (herein "Nishimura").

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of the allowable subject matter.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 36, 37, 61, 62, 66, 78, 98, and 99 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the admitted art in view of Kanai and Nishimura, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Applicants note that independent claims 36, 61, 66, 78, and 98 positively recite a feature of changing *both* of "the prescribed write clock frequency and the prescribed rotation number to prescribe levels in accordance with the temperature detected by said temperature detecting device". That is, independent Claim 36 requires a control that changes both of a write clock frequency and a rotation number of a light beam deflecting device based on the detected temperature. Each of independent Claims 61, 66, 78, and 98 also recite similar limitations. Such features are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

The outstanding rejection is based on the position that admitted art discloses correcting a magnification error by changing a prescribed write clock frequency and a prescribed rotation number according to a change in temperature.

More particularly, the Discussion of the Background section of the present specification discloses several prior art that disclose *either* changing a write clock frequency *or* controlling a rotation speed of a polygon mirror as a magnification correction. However, the admitted art does not disclose controlling both of those parameters in a single device, namely changing the prescribed write clock frequency *and* the prescribed rotation number based on a detected temperature. Applicants also submit that there is no suggestion or motivation alleged in any of the noted art to perform both such controls based on the detected temperature.

Applicants also note that the cited art itself to Kanai do and Mishimura do not disclose or suggest controlling both of a write clock frequency and a rotation number of a light beam deflecting device based on a detected temperature.

Thus, applicants respectfully submit that there is no noted suggestion in any of the cited art to control both such parameters as in the above-noted claims. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that each of independent Claims 36, 61, 66, 78, 98, and the claims dependent therefrom, distinguish over the applied art.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that each of the currently pending claims is allowable.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
GJM/SNS/smi

Surinder Sachar
Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

I:\ATTY\SSNS\20's\201377\201377US-AM2.DOC